

2/26

Kentucky
Agricultural Experiment Station
University of Kentucky

**PART-TIME FARMING IN FOUR REPRESENTA-
TIVE AREAS OF KENTUCKY**

BULLETIN NO. 358



Agricultural Experiment Station of the University of Kentucky, Federal
Emergency Relief Administration and Kentucky Emergency
Relief Administration co-operating.

Lexington, Ky.

August, 1935

(119)

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	121
The areas	122
The part-time farmers	123
Farming experience	123
Age	124
Occupations	124
Education	124
The farm enterprise	124
Acres operated	124
Acres in crops	125
Farm work done by operator	125
Investment	125
Debts	126
Livestock	126
Size of families	127
Income	127
Farm expenses	129
Operator's net earnings from the farm	129
The farm business in relation to amount of outside income.....	130
Farm receipts	130
Farm privileges	132
Farm expenses	133
Operator's net earnings from the farm	133
Reasons for becoming part-time farmers	134
Farm work	135
Relief	135
The farm business in relation to the operator's net earnings from the farm	136
Farm receipts	137
Livestock	138
Privileges	140
Farm expenses	141
Acres in crops	142
Distance from non-farming employment	142
Selection of the part-time farm	145
Crops and livestock	146
Summary	146

BULLETIN NO. 358

Part-Time Farming in Four Representative Areas of Kentucky*

By MERTON OYLER and W. W. ROSE

INTRODUCTION

With the advent of hard-surfaced roads and automobiles a new type of back-to-the-land movement has come about. An increasing number of urban people live in the country who continue to earn the major portion of their income in urban employment. It is no longer necessary to live in an urban center in order to work there. Many get part of their living from home gardens, family cows and small poultry flocks, whereas others do considerably more farming.

The data upon which this report is based were collected in the spring and summer of 1934 from 329 part-time farmers in four sections of Kentucky—100 near Louisville, 100 near Lexington, 43 near Richmond and 86 near Corbin and Barbourville.** The period covered was the year ending March 31, 1934. These families produced a part of their living from the land while the head of the family was customarily engaged in an occupation other than the operation of his home tract. A few unemployed persons, widows and retired couples who relied on savings, pensions, insurance or the assistance of others, were included. Country tradespeople such as operators of filling stations, country stores and eating places, were not included even

* Data for this study were collected and tabulated by workers furnished by the Kentucky Emergency Relief Administration and by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration and supervised by staff members of the Kentucky Agricultural Experiment Station. Credit is due David Clarke, J. W. Durrett, and H. F. Smoot for field work in collecting the schedules, and to Eugene Cravens and Albert Isham who aided in tabulating the data. The authors are indebted to Kenneth Hood of the New York State College of Agriculture whose published report of a similar study in New York furnished valuable suggestions on field schedules and methods of analysis.

** A separate report for each area is available for inspection at the Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Kentucky.

There are numerous tobacco redriers and storage warehouses. Agriculture is the foundation of the city's prosperity. Lack of industries has been the factor limiting the possibilities of part-time farming in this area.

Richmond, a city of 6,500 population in 1930, is the county seat of Madison County. It is representative of the county-seat towns in the Bluegrass Region and other fertile farm areas of Kentucky. Good soil for truck and gardens is adjacent to the city. Very few industries other than those associated with the marketing of tobacco and livestock are located in this city and for that reason the development of part-time farming in the vicinity is very limited.

The Corbin-Barbourville Area is in the foothills of the mountains of Southeastern Kentucky. The land is broken and infertile except for the narrow bottoms along the Cumberland River and its tributaries. The area is served by the Louisville and Nashville Railroad, the junction of which is at Corbin. Much thru freight en route between Northern and Southern states passes over this railroad, and a branch line is the principal outlet for the important coal fields of Bell and Harlan Counties. Corbin, with a population of 8,036 persons in 1930, occupies adjoining portions of Whitley, Knox and Laurel Counties. The development of coal mines in this area and the increase of coal shipments on the railroad during and following the war were principal factors in the rapid growth of this city. Coal mines and railroad shops offer the best opportunities for non-farm employment. Both industries have greatly reduced the number of their employees since 1929. Barbourville, the county seat of Knox County, had a population of 2,380 in 1930. Its industries, principally those related to the processing of wood, declined in recent years because of the diminished timber supply.

THE PART-TIME FARMERS

Farming experience. One-third of these 329 part-time farmers had previously been full-time farmers. Nearly all the others were part-time farmers previous to the year of study, but sixteen of them had moved to the country recently and had

good incomes from non-farming sources. They were interested in the farm not primarily for its economic returns, but for its aesthetic advantages.

Age. The 329 part-time farmers ranged in age from 21 to 77 years. One-fifth of them had passed the age of 55, but only nine had retired. Three-fifths of them were between the ages of 35 and 54. Only one-fifth were under 35 years of age. Their average age was 44 years and was about the same in each of the four areas.

Occupations. Twenty-six percent of the part-time farmers were unskilled laborers, 13 percent semi-skilled, and 27 percent skilled. Most of the unskilled laborers worked as farm hands, street laborers, firemen, and janitors and most of the skilled laborers as carpenters brick masons and painters. Twenty-five percent of these part-time farmers were clerical and professional workers or business men. Five percent were unemployed. An additional four percent had retired.

Education. Eighty-two percent of these part-time farmers had an education equal to or above the sixth grade. One percent of them had no schooling, 17 percent had attended school but had not passed the sixth grade, twenty-six percent had had some high school training, and eight percent had attended college. Forty-one percent of the part-time farmers in the Lexington Area had attended high school.

THE FARM ENTERPRISE

Acres operated. Most of the part-time farms were located near town where land was relatively high in price, hence the tracts were usually small. The operators did not desire large farms because outside employment occupied most of their time. The average size of the 329 part-time farms was 11.9 acres. The farms in the Corbin-Barbourville Area averaged 26.3 acres as compared with 5.8, 6.6, and 9.3 acres for the Lexington, Louisville, and Richmond Areas, respectively. Of the 329 farms, 139, or 42 percent had less than 2.5 acres each. Except in the Corbin-Barbourville Area only a small proportion of the farms were more than 35 acres.

Acres in crops. The 329 part-time farms had an average of 3.5 acres in crops, but most of the farms had much below that figure. Forty-two percent of the farms had one-half acre or less in crops, per farm. These percentages for the various areas were as follows: Louisville 62, Richmond 53, Lexington 42, and Corbin-Barbourville 14. Twenty percent of the farms had over five acres in crops. The percentages in the various areas were, Louisville 9, Lexington 11, Richmond 25, and Corbin-Barbourville 40.

The average part-time farm had 4.0 acres in pasture. Pasture acreage varied from 1.9 acres in the Lexington Area to 8.5 in the Corbin-Barbourville Area. The Corbin-Barbourville Area had 7.8 acres of untillable land per farm as compared with approximately 0.6 of an acre for the other three areas.

Farm work done by operator. The average part-time farmer in the four areas engaged in farm work a total of 3.2 months per year or an average of two hours per day. The time varied from an average of eight-tenths of an hour per day in winter to 2.7 hours in summer and from no work by some to nearly full-time farming by other operators. On those part-time farms where the operator did no farm work, such work was done by other members of the family. In this study, a farm day is considered seven and one-half hours and a month as 30 days.

Investment. Ninety-eight percent of the total agricultural investment of the 236 owner-operated part-time farms was in real estate. The farms with the higher total investment had a smaller proportionate investment in livestock and machinery than the farms that had a lower total investment. The investment in real estate ranged from approximately \$300 to \$17,000, the largest number of farms being in the group that had investments ranging from \$2,000 to \$3,999. For each area the farm investment averaged as follows: Corbin-Barbourville \$2,545, Richmond \$3,261, Louisville \$4,176 and Lexington \$5,326. The investment in machinery was very low. The average investment in livestock and machinery was \$82 and \$41 for the 236 owners and the 93 renters, respectively. The owners in the Louisville Area had livestock and machinery investments about one-half as high as did the owners in the other three areas.

Table 1. Distribution of Agricultural Investment on 236 Owner-Operated Part-Time Farms.

Agricultural Investment	No. of farms	Total investment	Investment in					
			Real Estate		Livestock		Machinery	
			Average	Percent	Average	Percent	Average	Percent
Under \$2000	67	\$ 1210	\$ 1154	95.4	\$ 50	4.1	\$ 6	.5
\$2000 to \$3999	77	2842	2754	96.9	69	2.4	19	.7
\$4000 to \$5999	43	4935	4853	98.3	67	1.4	15	.3
\$6000 to \$7999	24	6632	6544	98.7	71	1.1	14	.2
\$8000 or over	25	10475	10344	98.7	110	1.1	21	.2
All farms	236	\$ 3954	\$ 3872	97.9	\$ 68	1.7	\$14	.4

Debts. The farm mortgage debts of the 236 owners averaged \$581, other debts \$3 and non-farm debts \$64. This total indebtedness of \$648 is 14 percent of the total investment. The indebtedness for the Corbin-Barbourville Area was only \$193 per owned farm—a figure much lower than for the other three areas. The corresponding figures were \$480, \$783, and \$946 for the Richmond, Lexington, and Louisville Areas, respectively. Only 89 of these owned farms were mortgaged, the average amount of the mortgage being \$1,540. For the areas these averages were: the Richmond Area \$771, the Corbin-Barbourville Area \$803, the Louisville Area \$1,583 and the Lexington Area \$2,153. Twenty-five owners who had no farm mortgage had some indebtedness not secured by mortgage.

The average debt of the 93 renters was \$82, or \$206 for the 37 renters that had such debts. Only one renter reported a farm debt and it was for \$15. The renters in the Richmond and Louisville Areas had debts averaging \$247 and \$369, respectively, per farm reporting, as compared with \$81, and \$110, respectively, for the Lexington and Corbin-Barbourville Areas. About the same percentage of renters in each area had debts.

Livestock. The investment in cows comprised nearly one-half the total livestock investment for the average part-time farm. There was an average of 0.8 cows and 23 chickens per farm but only 199 operators reported cows and 286 operators

reported chickens kept on the farm. Only 72 kept brood sows altho 68 others bought hogs for home butchering. There was an average of three-tenths of a horse or mule per farm, or an investment of \$14 in such livestock. Twenty-two of the operators kept no livestock.

Size of families. Classified into three groups, 115 of the 329 families had three or less adult male units* per family, 123 had 3.1 to 4.5, and 91 had 4.6 or more units. The group with the largest families had the largest number of acres in crops, the highest value of livestock kept, the highest value of unpaid family labor, and used the most garden products. All these items increased rather consistently with the size of family. The outside income was highest for the medium-sized family group, altho the variation for the groups was not great.

The group with small families consisted chiefly of young couples with but few children or of retired couples whose children had left home. The heads of many of these families were too young or too old to be able to earn a maximum industrial income. Therefore, the families in this group generally had a smaller outside income but this did not necessarily mean a lower standard of living since their requirements were less. These families had smaller farms and less livestock and needed less garden food stuffs, than the other two groups. The unpaid family labor was low because the family was small and the operator was often the only person who did farm work.

Income. The total income for the 329 part-time farmers averaged \$1,311 of which \$877, or 67 percent, was received from work done off the farm (Table 2). Farm receipts comprised only \$77, or 6 percent of the total, while farm privileges amounted to \$335, or 26 percent of the total income. The total incomes for the four areas averaged as follows: Richmond \$862, Corbin-Barbourville \$1,257, Louisville \$1,303, and Lexington

* Since there was a wide difference in the age and number of children in different families, each family was reduced to an "adult-male-unit" basis, each unit requiring the amount of food necessary for a moderately active male in good health, between 18 and 60 years of age. The operator, his wife, and all other persons in the household were considered moderately active. In arriving at the adult-male-unit figure, the method used was that of Dr. Edith Hawley, reported as the energy scale in Technical Bul. No. 8, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

\$1,560. The percentage of income that was received from work off the farm for the four areas was as follows: Richmond 44, Lexington 66, Louisville 70, and Corbin-Barbourville 73 per cent. Farm privileges composed the next largest item. It is therefore evident that outside employment is the chief factor influencing the income of these part-time farmers. Farm receipts were lowest in the industrial areas of Corbin-Barbourville and Louisville, and highest in the Richmond Area where they accounted for 18 percent of the total income (Table 5). Farm crops, the chief farm receipts, consisted chiefly of tobacco, in the Lexington and Richmond Areas, while garden products and fruit were the important items in the Corbin-Barbourville and Louisville Areas.

Table 2. Analysis of Incomes of 329 Part-Time Farmers, Grouped by Size of Operator's Outside Income.

	All farms		Group 1 None	Group 2 \$1 to \$499	Group 3 \$500 to \$999	Group 4 \$1000 to \$1499	Group 5 \$1500 or over
	Average	Percent					
Number of farms	329		17	103	85	58	66
Farm receipts:							
Crops	\$ 38	2.8	\$ 55	\$ 72	\$ 10	\$ 20	\$ 29
Livestock products	18	1.4	21	19	12	15	28
Livestock increase	10	.8	19	6	12	13	11
Boarders and roomers	2	.2		*		6	4
Other farm receipts	9	.7	16	9	7	6	13
Total farm receipts	\$ 77	5.9	\$111	\$106	\$ 41	\$ 60	\$ 85
Privileges:							
Food furnished by farm for home use:							
Fruits and vegetables	\$ 45	3.5	\$ 42	\$ 47	\$ 40	\$ 36	\$ 60
Meat, milk, eggs, etc.	96	7.3	107	97	81	107	102
Total food	\$ 141	10.8	\$149	\$144	\$ 121	\$ 143	\$ 162
Value of use of dwelling	194	14.8	294	125	173	200	297
Total privileges	\$ 335	25.6	\$443	\$269	\$ 294	\$ 343	\$ 459
Outside income:							
Work off farm	\$ 877	66.8	\$ ----	\$204	\$ 731	\$1187	\$2069
Pensions	8	.6	-----	5	10	21	-----
Insurance compensation	2	.2	-----	*	9	-----	-----
Direct and work relief	12	.9	-----	31	8	-----	1
Total outside income	\$ 899	68.5	\$ ----	\$240	\$ 758	\$1208	\$2070
Total income	\$1311	100.0	\$554	\$615	\$1093	\$1611	\$2614

*Less than 50 cents.

Farm expenses. Farm expenses averaged \$236 for the 329 part-time farmers. Cash expenses amounted to \$166, of which the principal items were hired labor, feed, insurance, taxes, rent, and repairs of buildings, fences and machinery (Table 3). Cash expenses were somewhat higher for the Lexington Area than for the other three areas. The chief non-cash expenses were unpaid family labor* and depreciation on real estate. Since there was more unpaid labor on some farms than on others this was charged as an expense in order that all farms might be comparable. The Corbin-Barbourville Area was below and the Lexington Area above the state average for most items of expense.

Table 3. Analysis of Expenses on 329 Part-Time Farms Grouped by Operator's Outside Income.

	All farms		Group 1 None	Group 2 \$1 to \$499	Group 3 \$500 to \$999	Group 4 \$1000 to \$1499	Group 5 \$1500 or over
	Average	Percent					
Number of farms	329		17	103	85	58	66
Farm expenses:							
Cash expenses	\$166	70.2	\$222	\$117	\$150	\$177	\$236
Unpaid family labor	34	14.4	12	55	31	16	27
Livestock decrease	2	1.0	2	3	3	2	1
Depreciation on real estate	33	14.0	60	23	28	33	49
Depreciation on machinery	1	.3	2	1	*	1	1
Decrease in feed and supplies	*	.1	—	*	—	—	1
Total expenses	\$236	100.0	\$298	\$199	\$212	\$229	\$315

Operator's net earnings from the farm. Farm receipts plus value of privileges less farm expenses averaged \$176 per part-time farm (Table 4). Interest at 5 percent on the capital investment including the dwelling averaged \$142. The difference between these two amounts \$34, can be considered the operator's net earnings from the farm for the year. The average part-time farmer received \$899 outside income** which with

* This is the value of all labor not hired, other than that of the operator.

** It will be noted in Table 2 that receipts from charity, relief agencies, old age or other pensions, and insurance compensations are included in outside income.

the \$34 net earnings from the farm made a total operator's labor earnings of \$933.*** Farmers in the Richmond Area had net earnings from the farm of \$138. This figure was much above the corresponding figure for the other three areas. However, the farmers in the Richmond Area had low outside incomes and this resulted in their operator's labor earnings, \$575, being much below the corresponding figure for the other areas.

Table 4. Analysis of Operator's Labor Earnings on 329 Part-Time Farms Grouped by Operator's Outside Income.

	All farms	Group 1 None	Group 2 \$1 to \$499	Group 3 \$500 to \$999	Group 4 \$1000 to \$1499	Group 5 \$1500 or over
Number of farms	329	17	103	85	58	66
Farm receipts plus value of privileges	\$412	\$554	\$375	\$335	\$ 403	\$ 544
Farm expenses	236	298	199	212	229	315
Farm receipts plus privileges minus farm expenses	\$176	\$256	\$176	\$123	\$ 174	\$ 229
Interest on investment @ 5 %	142	266	100	117	143	210
Operator's net earnings from farm	\$ 34	\$-10	\$ 76	\$ 6	\$ 31	\$ 19
Outside income	899	-----	240	758	1208	2070
Operator's labor earnings*	\$933	\$-10	\$316	\$764	\$1239	\$2089

* Operator's labor earnings includes \$22 from pensions, insurance compensation, and direct and work relief, as shown in Table 2 under outside income. Earnings on all investments, including 5 percent on the farm investment, are excluded from the operator's labor earnings.

THE FARM BUSINESS IN RELATION TO AMOUNT OF OUTSIDE INCOME

Since income from outside sources greatly exceeded other kinds of income for these part-time farmers, outside income was used as a basis for grouping the farms for an analysis of the farm business. The operator's outside income ranged from nothing to \$3,500 and averaged \$899. Over one-third of the 329 operators received an outside income less than \$500, 17 of them had no outside income (Table 2). The Richmond and the Corbin-Barbourville Areas had a large portion of their farms in the \$1 to \$499 outside income group.

Farm receipts. Farm receipts were low for all the groups

*** Operator's labor earnings is the sum of operator's net earnings from the farm plus total outside income.

Part-Time Farming in Four Representative Areas 131

(Table 2). The two lower groups had much higher farm receipts than did the three groups with greater outside income. Most of the operators with no outside income were elderly or retired.

Table 5. Analysis of Farm Business by Areas on 329 Kentucky Part-Time Farms in 1933.

	Louisville	Lexington	Corbin Barbourville	Richmond
Number of farms	100	100	86	43
Farm receipts:				
Crops	\$ 12	\$ 64	\$ 5	\$ 97
Livestock products	17	27	9	19
Livestock increase	7	15	4	18
Other farm receipts	12	9	11	18
Total farm receipts	48	115	29	152
Privileges:				
Food furnished by the farm:				
Fruits, vegetables, etc.	32	47	62	39
Meat, milk, eggs, etc.	82	97	102	117
Total food furnished	114	144	164	156
Value of use of dwelling	222	260	123	117
Total privileges	336	404	287	273
Outside income:				
Operator's work off the farm	906	1025	922	376
Pensions	•	12	6	18
Direct relief and work relief	7	4	11	43
Other (insurance compensation) ..	6	•	2	—
Total outside income	919	1041	941	437
Farm expenses:				
Cash expenses	156	226	116	147
Unpaid family labor	29	35	37	37
Livestock decrease	2	2	2	3
Depreciation on real estate	40	44	21	18
Depreciation on machinery	•	1	1	1
Decrease in feed and supplies	—	1	—	—
Total expenses	227	309	177	206
Farm receipts plus privileges minus farm expenses	157	210	139	219
Interest on investment @ 5%	161	184	102	81
Operator's net earnings from the farm	—4	26	37	138
Operator's labor earnings**	\$915	\$1067	\$978	\$575

* Less than fifty cents.

** This item is the sum of operator's net earnings from the farm and operator's outside income.

However, since they had no outside employment they tried to earn as much as possible from the farm. Persons in the \$1 to \$499 group had to depend upon the farm almost entirely for their living. Consequently they were obliged to put forth a greater effort to produce products for sale than did the part-time farmers with larger outside incomes. Farm receipts ranged from nothing on 86 farms to \$1185 on one farm. The 86 farms that had no farm receipts were distributed among the five outside income groups in the following order: One in the \$0 group, 22 in the \$1 to \$499 group, 24 in the \$500 to \$999 group, 23 in the \$1000 to \$1499 group, and 16 in the group with an outside income of \$1500 or over.¹ The largest item of farm receipts was from crops and this item showed the greatest variation on individual farms and among the different outside-income groups. In the Louisville and Corbin-Barbourville Areas the largest item of farm receipts was from livestock products, principally dairy and poultry products.

Farm privileges. The value of food furnished by the farm for home use was highest for the group with an outside income of \$1500 or over (Table 2), but variation in this item in the different groups was not great. Livestock products furnished twice as much food value for home use as did fruits and vegetables.

The value of the use of the dwelling was the largest single item in the farm income, altho it varied widely in amount among the different outside-income groups and for the different areas. It was highest in the Lexington and Louisville Areas where more expensive dwellings were used. In those areas the use of the dwelling averaged more than the value of the combined items of farm receipts and food furnished by the farm. In the Richmond and Corbin-Barbourville Areas the use of the dwelling was valued at less than food furnished by the farm. The value of the use of the dwelling on tracts owned by the operators was calculated at 10 percent of the estimated value of the dwelling. For rented tracts an allocation of the total rental figure was made between the dwelling and remainder of the property. The use of the house usually was approximately two-

thirds of the total privileges furnished by the farm. The use of the dwelling was valued highest for the group with no outside income and the group that had an outside income of \$1500 or over. Families of both these groups were living in good houses and were maintaining a high standard of living. The next to the lowest outside income group had the lowest-priced houses. The rental value of their dwellings was lower than total value of food furnished by the farm.

Farm expenses. The group that had outside incomes of \$1 to \$499 had the lowest cash expenses, the lowest total expenses, the lowest depreciation on real estate and the highest value of unpaid family labor (Table 3). Operators in that group had only a small outside income and were particularly interested in keeping cash expenditures at a minimum. Making full use of all available family labor was a means to that end. If the group with no outside income is excluded, farm expenses increased with each successively higher income group. Hired labor, feed, repairs on dwelling, seed, insurance, taxes and rent were the chief expenses.

In each outside income group the renters had lower capital expenses than did the owners (Table 6). This was partly due to the more desirable and more productive properties of the owners and partly to the economic advantages of renting during a period of low prices. More than two-thirds of the total capital expenses of the owners consisted of depreciation and interest on investment, neither of which represent cash outlay. Operating expenses on the owned farms were higher than on the rented farms. Unpaid family labor, hired labor, feed and seed costs were the chief operating expenses.

Operator's net earnings from the farm. The \$1 to \$499 outside income group ranked lowest in farm expenses, next to highest in farm receipts, and highest in operator's net farm earnings. The group that had no outside income had high farm receipts and privileges, but, farm expenses and interest on investment were larger for that group than for any other group and it had the lowest operator's net earnings from the farm. Farmers in this group had high investment charges and high

Table 6. Capital and Operating Expenses of Part-Time Farmers by Operator's Outside Income Groups and Tenure.

	All operators		Group 1 None		Group 2 \$1 to \$499		Group 3 \$500 to \$999		Group 4 \$1000 to \$1499		Group 5 \$1500 or over	
	Owners	Renters	Owners	Renters	Owners	Renters	Owners	Renters	Owners	Renters	Owners	Renters
Number of farms	236	93	17	---	66	37	57	28	45	13	51	15
Capital expenses:												
Repairs	\$ 23	\$ *	\$ 40	\$ ---	\$ 18	\$ *	\$ 17	\$ 1	\$ 22	\$ 1	\$ 31	\$ ---
Insurance	18	*	23	---	11	---	15	*	23	2	27	---
Taxes	29	*	41	---	23	---	28	---	28	1	37	---
Depreciation	47	*	63	---	37	---	42	*	43	---	65	1
Interest on invest.	198	2	266	---	154	2	173	1	184	2	270	3
Cash rent	2	153	*	---	1	97	3	139	1	202	3	273
Total capital expenses	\$317	\$155	\$433	\$---	\$244	\$ 99	\$278	\$141	\$301	\$208	\$433	\$277
Operating expenses:												
Unpaid family labor	\$ 36	\$ 30	\$ 12	\$ ---	\$ 59	\$ 47	\$ 37	\$ 18	\$ 15	\$ 19	\$ 31	\$ 17
Board of hired labor	*	2	---	---	*	1	---	*	1	*	1	10
Hired labor	15	7	43	---	8	15	10	*	10	6	27	3
Feed: roughage	10	5	14	---	8	4	7	5	11	5	12	10
grain	34	19	35	---	21	9	36	22	49	16	35	42
Seeds, plants, trees	8	4	13	---	6	3	8	5	3	3	15	3
Auto for farm use	3	2	3	---	3	4	2	---	3	1	3	1
Other expenses	13	7	12	---	12	7	15	5	11	6	13	9
Total operating expenses	\$119	\$ 76	\$132	\$---	\$117	\$ 90	\$115	\$ 55	\$103	\$ 56	\$137	\$ 95
Total expenses	\$436	\$231	\$565	\$---	\$361	\$189	\$393	\$196	\$404	\$264	\$570	\$372

* Less than 50 cents.

cash expenses, and lost money on their farms. All 17 families that had no outside income were owners. Seven of the operators were retired and three were widowed. These were elderly persons using their property as a place in which to spend their declining years and they were making little attempt to operate their farms at a profit. Seven other operators were involuntarily unemployed. Most of them made an effort to earn a living from their farms, but being elderly they hired most of their work done and their expenses were so high that they operated at a loss.

Reasons for becoming part-time farmers. Most of the part-time farmers in this study had only one outside job and the yearly outside income depended upon the duration of that job

and the wages earned from it. However, many of the operators in the group with outside income from \$1 to \$499 worked at several kinds of jobs. The farm operators who had high outside incomes worked more days off the farm, and also received a higher wage per day.

Of the 329 part-time farmers, 281 came to their present locations from the city and 48 from the country. In the Richmond Area two-thirds of the operators came from the country, while in the Louisville Area only three of the operators came from the country. The great majority of the part-time farmers who came from the city, especially those in the higher outside-income groups, stated that they moved to the country for aesthetic rather than economic advantages, most of them assigning love of country life or the desire to provide play space for their children as the chief reasons for undertaking part-time farming. The persons in the \$1 to \$499 outside-income group gave various reasons for becoming part-time farmers. Usually economic reasons such as the desire to grow a garden, get the benefit of low rents, to provide security in old age or to escape unemployment in the city, were given. Most of the part-time farmers who came from the country were in the two lowest outside income groups and were interested in part-time farming for economic reasons. Few of them had satisfactory outside employment so they were forced to earn most of their income from the farm. Persons in the group that had no outside income undertook part-time farming so that they might live at reduced expense during unemployed or declining years.

Farm work. The farmers that had \$1 to \$499 outside income averaged more months of farm work per year and more hours of farm work per day than those in any other group. They had higher farm earnings and worked fewer days off the farm than any other group that had outside income. The group of operators with no outside income ranked second in the amount of time that they worked on their farms. However, the time worked on the farm by operators was not proportional to the income derived by them from work away from the farm.

Relief. Thirty-six of the 329 part-time farmers received

Table 7. Relation of Operator's Outside Income to Farm Work.

	All farms	Group 1 None	Group 2 \$1 to \$499	Group 3 \$500 to \$999	Group 4 \$1000 to \$1499	Group 5 \$1500 or over
Number of farms -----	329	17	103	85	58	66
Days worked off farm ..	202	---	97	235	285	302
Ave. outside income ..	\$899	---	\$240	\$758	\$1208	\$2070
Ave. pay per day -----	\$ 4.45	---	\$ 2.48	\$ 3.22	\$ 4.24	\$ 6.84
Months worked off farm	3.3	4.2	4.7	2.3	2.7	2.5
Hrs. worked daily on farm:						
(Spring) -----	2.6	3.4	3.8	1.8	2.0	1.8
(Summer) -----	2.8	3.6	3.9	2.0	2.4	2.2
(Fall) -----	2.1	2.5	3.4	1.4	1.6	1.5
(Winter) -----	.8	.9	1.1	.5	.8	.8

relief from public agencies. Twenty-seven of these operators were in the group that had an outside income of \$1 to \$499, and nine were in the group that had an outside income of \$500 to \$999. Relief was one of the items of "outside income" but only seven operators received all their income from that source. Most of these farmers received work relief rather than direct aid. One-third of the part-time farmers in the Richmond Area and one-eighth of them in the Corbin-Barbourville Area received relief. These were much higher proportions than in the Lexington and Louisville Areas.

THE FARM BUSINESS IN RELATION TO THE OPERATOR'S NET EARNINGS FROM FARM

The success of the farm from a business standpoint depends upon an excess of income over expenses. The part-time farmers who were renters had earnings from the farm ranging from a loss of \$366 to a profit of \$733. Owners had farm earnings ranging from a loss of \$521 to a profit of \$919.

The farm earnings in the Lexington Area showed greater variations than in any other area. The operators in the Richmond Area averaged the largest farm earnings, \$138, and the Louisville Area the lowest farm earnings, a loss of \$8 for the year. In the Richmond and Louisville Areas the renters had farm earnings of \$181 and \$51, respectively; the owners \$94 and minus \$21. In the other two areas the owners had slightly

higher earnings than the renters. When the four areas are combined the 93 renters earned \$71 on their farms as compared with \$19 for the 236 owners.

One of the reasons for this study was to ascertain whether families which have a non-farm source of income derive an economic advantage by living in the country and procuring at least part of their food supply and possibly some products for sale, and if so, to what extent. In this analysis of the farm business, the value of the use of the dwelling and dwelling expenses, i. e., repairs, taxes, insurance and interest on the house investment, have been omitted in order to permit a study of the contribution of the farm itself to operator's net earnings from the farm.

Farm receipts. There was a direct relation between farm receipts and operator's net earnings from the farm (Table 8). Over half the farms studied had cash receipts under \$20. Cash receipts per farm were lowest in the Louisville Area, \$48, and highest in the Richmond Area, \$152. Thirty percent of the operators in the Richmond Area had cash farm receipts over \$200, while only 7 percent in the Louisville Area had receipts so high. The group that had the highest farm receipts also had the highest operator's labor earnings. Although these farmers had slightly lower outside incomes, they were not low enough to offset the higher earnings from the farm that resulted from the higher farm receipts.

Table 8. Relation of Cash Farm Receipts to Operator's Net Earnings from the Farm.

Farm Receipts		Number of farms	Net earnings
Group	Average		
Less than \$20	\$ 4	184	\$-1
\$20 to \$199	74	106	28
\$200 or more	428	39	217
All farms	\$ 77	329	\$ 34

The net earnings from the farm tended to increase as the farm receipts, the number of cows, the number of chickens and the size of farm increased (Table 9). Sale of milk, eggs, to-

bacco and garden truck caused the larger receipts in the groups that had the highest net earnings from the farm. The operators in the Lexington Area had larger receipts from livestock products but smaller from farm crops than those in the Richmond Area. However the total farm receipts were smaller in the Lexington Area than in the Richmond Area.

Table 9. Items of the Farm Business Grouped by Operator's Net Earnings from the Farm.

	All farms	Group 1 \$—100 or less	Group 2 \$—99 to \$0	Group 3 \$1 to \$99	Group 4 \$100 to \$199	Group 5 \$200 or more
Number of farms	329	43	87	118	50	31
Acres operated	11.9	13.5	8.3	9.7	16.1	20.9
Cows (number)	8	8	6	6	1.1	1.5
Poultry (number)	23	28	18	18	27	43
Inventory value of:						
Livestock	\$60	\$78	\$42	\$41	\$72	\$134
Cattle	28	28	18	20	38	65
Poultry	12	13	10	9	14	22
Farm receipts:						
Livestock products:						
Milk	\$ 5	\$ 2	\$ 2	\$ 2	\$ 5	\$ 31
Eggs	6	12	2	5	4	20
Other	7	12	4	3	6	22
Total	\$18	\$26	\$ 8	\$10	\$15	\$ 73
Crop sales:						
Tobacco	\$24	\$24	\$ 7	\$ 6	\$18	\$148
Garden	10	6	3	7	12	35
Other	4	1	5	3	4	11
Total	\$38	\$31	\$15	\$16	\$34	\$194
Miscellaneous	\$21	\$21	\$ 7	\$16	\$20	\$ 86
Total farm receipts	\$77	\$78	\$30	\$42	\$69	\$353

Livestock. It was shown to be characteristic of the more profitable farms that there were cows and poultry and in greater numbers than on the less productive ones. Operator's net earnings from the farm and operator's labor income had a tendency to increase with value of livestock kept. Operators who kept no livestock evidently missed an opportunity to increase their farm earnings. This was true especially in the Richmond, Lexington and Corbin-Barbourville Areas. In the Louisville Area there was no correlation between value of livestock kept and operator's net farm earnings.

Part-Time Farming in Four Representative Areas 139

Table 10. Relation of Investment in Livestock to Operator's Net Earnings from the Farm and Operator's Labor Earnings.

Value of livestock kept		Number of farms	Operator's net earnings from farm	Operator's labor earnings
Group	Average			
Less than \$10	\$ 3	90	\$ 2	\$ 926
\$10 to \$39	27	72	21	835
\$40 to \$149	73	138	58	947
\$150 to \$299	214	23	31	1084
\$300 or more	407	6	136	1315
All farms	\$ 60	329	\$ 34	\$ 933

It must not be inferred, however, that all livestock is conducive to profitable farming. The kind of livestock was more important than amount, in determining net farm earnings. The earnings from the farm showed a direct relationship to the number of cows and chickens per farm (Tables 11 and 12). An operator who kept 40 or more chickens and at least one cow for home production was more likely to have higher net earnings than one who did not.

Operator's net earnings from the farm were higher on one-cow farms than on two-cow farms. Except in the Richmond Area, when three or more cows were kept net farm earnings increased considerably because enough dairy products in excess of the family needs were produced to permit economic sale. Except in the Louisville Area part-time farmers who kept 40 or more chickens had higher net farm earnings than those with a smaller number.

Table 11. Relation of Number of Cows Kept on Part-Time Farms to Operator's Net Earnings from the Farm and Operator's Labor Earnings.

Number of cows		Number of farms	Operator's net earnings from farm	Operator's labor earnings
Group	Average			
None	---	135	\$-1	\$ 900
1	1.0	143	56	901
2	2.0	39	44	1051
3 or more	3.3	12	140	1302
All farms	.8	329	\$ 34	\$ 933

Table 12. Relation of Number of Chickens Kept on Part-Time Farms to Operator's Net Earnings from the Farm and Operator's Labor Earnings.

Number of chickens		Number of farms	Operator's net earnings from farm	Operator's labor earnings
Group	Average			
Less than 10	3	85	\$ 30	\$ 856
10 to 39	20	191	17	887
40 to 109	61	51	99	1251
110 or more	140	2	196	503
All farms	23	329	\$ 34	\$ 933

Privileges. Food furnished from the farm for home use ranged from \$9 to more than \$500, on individual farms. There was no significant difference between owners and renters except in the Richmond and Corbin-Barbourville Areas where the owners averaged the higher amount. The value of food furnished by the farm for home use averaged the highest (\$164) in the Corbin-Barbourville Area and the lowest (\$115) in the Louisville Area.

In each area, operator's net earnings from the farm showed a slight tendency to increase as the value of food furnished by the farm increased. Moreover, those operators whose farms furnished them largest values of food for home use, usually were the same operators who earned the largest incomes from outside work (Table 13).

Table 13. Relation of Value of Food Products Furnished by the Farm for Home Use to Operator's Net Earnings from Farm and Operator's Labor Earnings.

Value of food furnished by farm for home use		Number of farms	Operator's net earnings from farm	Operator's labor earnings
Group	Average			
\$75 or less	\$ 46	99	\$—4	\$ 887
\$76 to \$150	113	92	—11	886
\$151 to \$225	184	90	60	924
\$226 or more	315	48	150	1138
All farms	\$141	329	\$ 34	\$ 933

The value of food furnished by the farm increased regularly with net farm earnings, if the lowest earnings group is excepted (Table 14). Those in the group that had the highest net farm

earnings used nearly twice as much home grown food (chiefly garden, dairy, and meat products) as the average for all operators. For the three groups with positive farm earnings, the value of food furnished by the farm was more than enough to offset all farm expenses other than those on the dwelling. This left at least the cash receipts as the profit, or operator's net farm earnings, for these three groups. (See page 137 for a discussion of dwelling expenses which were offset by value of use of dwelling.)

Table 14. Value of Food Products Furnished by the Farm in Relation to Operator's Net Earnings from the Farm.

	All farms	Group 1 \$—100 or less	Group 2 \$—99 to \$0	Group 3 \$1 to \$99	Group 4 \$100 to \$199	Group 5 \$200 or more
Number of farms	329	43	87	118	50	31
Crops furnished by farm:						
Vegetables	\$ 38	\$ 39	\$ 31	\$ 33	\$ 52	\$ 58
Fruits	7	8	5	5	11	11
Total	\$ 45	\$ 47	\$ 36	\$ 38	\$ 63	\$ 69
Livestock products:						
Meat	\$ 25	\$ 26	\$ 18	\$ 20	\$ 37	\$ 46
Milk	24	23	21	15	30	62
Butter	17	14	11	16	25	27
Eggs	16	15	12	15	22	24
Skim-milk	5	4	3	4	10	7
Buttermilk	4	3	1	5	3	15
Other*	5	4	3	3	9	7
Total	\$ 96	\$ 89	\$ 69	\$ 78	\$136	\$188
Total food furnished	\$141	\$136	\$105	\$116	\$199	\$257

* Chiefly cream and cheese.

Farm expenses. Obviously the farm expenses on these part-time farms were low because the farm business was small. Excessively high expenses were one of the important reasons for lack of financial success on those part-time farms that showed negative operator's net earnings from the farm.

In all except the Richmond Area, capital expenses* were highest for the group that had the lowest net farm earnings. In each area operating expenses* were highest for the group that had the lowest farm earnings. Larger charges for unpaid family

* These expenses are itemized on Table 6.

labor, hired labor, and feed costs were the chief reasons for these higher operating expenses. It was found that curtailing farm expenses was profitable, tho very low expenses limited the farm business, and high expenses increased the difficulty of showing a profit.

Acres in crops. It should be noted that 42 percent of all the farmers had less than six-tenths of an acre in crops. The operator's net earnings from the farm increased in direct relation to an increase in the acres in crops. The Louisville Area was an exception. In that area 62 percent of the farms had less than six-tenths of an acre in crops, and the nine farmers that had less than six-tenths of an acre in crops and the nine with more than 5 acres in crops lost money on their farms.

Table 15. Relation of Acres of Crops to Operator's Net Earnings from the Farm and Operator's Labor Earnings.

Acres of crops		Number of farms	Operator's net earnings from farm	Operator's labor earnings
Group	Average			
Less than 0.6	.3	139	\$ 11	\$949
0.6 to 5.0	2.1	125	41	992
5.1 to 15.0	8.7	49	50	770
15.1 or more	27.3	16	133	829
All farms	3.6	329	\$ 34	\$933

DISTANCE FROM NON-FARMING EMPLOYMENT

In selecting a part-time farm an important consideration is its distance from the operator's job off the farm. The importance of the distance increases with the steadiness of outside employment. If the farm is to contribute the major portion of the operator's earnings, its location for economic production is more important than proximity to the operator's outside employment. One-fifth of these part-time farmers, altho employed off the farm, had to pay no transportation costs. Most of them were laborers who lived within walking distance of their jobs. A few were provided with company automobiles or given free transportation by their employers.

Approximately half of these farmers had to pay transportation costs. These traveled an average 5.5 miles to work at a

cost of 28 cents per day. Only 29 of them traveled more than 9 miles to work. Their transportation costs were so high, 54 cents a day, that it is doubtful if living in the country saved them any money. If the head of the family worked 18 days per month, he could afford to pay \$10 more rent per month for a similar home within walking distance of his work. Transportation expenses become correspondingly less important with fewer days of employment away from the farm. The distance to work for the operators that had transportation costs averaged as follows, for the four areas: Richmond 1.3 miles, Corbin-Barbourville 4.8 miles, Lexington 5.6 miles, and Louisville 6.8 miles. Only 23 percent of the part-time farmers in the Richmond Area had transportation costs, as compared with 66 percent in the Louisville Area.

Table 16. Relation between Miles to Work and Transportation Costs per Day.

	Miles to work	Number of operators	Days of outside work	Transportation cost, cents per day
Retired or unemployed		25		
No transportation cost	2.1	81	180.4	
Transportation cost not available		53	238.4	
Less than 1 mile	.3	4	187.2	2
1.0 to 4.9 miles	2.8	90	249.2	19
5.8 to 8.9 miles	6.1	47	221.6	31
9.0 miles and over	14.2	29	215.7	54
Average	5.6*	329	220.5†	28*

* Average for 170 farmers having transportation costs.

† Average for 300 farmers having outside employment.

These part-time farmers generally had low automobile operating costs because they used old cars on which depreciation costs were low (Table 17). Most of them did not use their cars for extensive driving. They were able to get along with cheap tires and a low standard of mechanical efficiency. The laboring group who wore work clothes were prepared to make repairs on their cars to and from work if necessary. If low cost per mile is to be attained with newer and more expensive cars that have a higher depreciation cost, they must be driven a

greater number of miles yearly. The low cost of operating a small car more than offsets its higher cost as a second-hand car, as compared with a used car of a heavier type.

The part-time farmers that lived on unimproved dirt roads had the highest farm earnings and the lowest labor earnings of any group. Most of these farmers were in the Richmond Area: a few were in the Corbin-Barbourville Area. They had little outside employment and probably located where farming could be carried on most economically since that was their chief source of income. Most of the operators that lived on dirt roads were only a short distance from an all-weather road, which could be reached without difficulty except in extreme weather. Their high farm earnings were due to fertile soil, ability of the operator and types of farm enterprises that were associated with living on an unimproved dirt road, rather than to the unimproved road itself.

All the farms on cinder or slag roads were in the Louisville Area where net farm earnings averaged very low. Only one-fourth of these farms were rated as having good soils while the soils on nearly one-third of the farms were classed as poor. Most of these families owned their farms and moved to the country either for the health of some member of the family or because they desired to live in the country.

Table 17. Relation of Type of Road to Operator's Net Earnings from the Farm, Operator's Labor Earnings, and Cost of Operating Automobiles of Various Price Classes.

	Hard surfaced or gravel	Cinder or slag	Graded dirt	Unimproved dirt
Number of farms	267	23	21	18
Operator's net earnings from farm	\$ 39	\$—61	\$ 22	\$ 92
Operator's labor earnings	\$998	\$ 673	\$819	\$443
Farmers using low-priced cars:				
Number	118	9	9	2
Ave. age (yrs.)	5	7	5	4
Ave. season's mileage	7123	7613	4796	6950
Cost per mile	\$0.027	\$0.017	\$0.032	\$0.031
Farmers using medium-priced cars:				
Number	48	4	1	—
Ave. age (yrs.)	5	6	5	—
Ave season's mileage	6199	12250	8000	—
Cost per mile	\$0.03	\$0.019	\$0.03	—

SELECTION OF THE PART-TIME FARM

If an amateur hopes to save money by part-time farming, he should locate where part-time farmers are prospering. Cheap land is a great attraction to many but the inexperienced person is the last one who should buy poor soil. His lack of knowledge will be handicap enough without the additional handicap of poor soil. If he locates in a well developed part-time farming area, his chances of success are greater than in an undeveloped territory and, if he fails, the capital investment can be more readily recovered because the farm is more readily salable.

The smaller the non-farm income of the prospective part-time farmer and the greater his need for food and cash receipts from the farm, the more importance he should attach to the quality of the land. A given amount of land can be made a good soil if one has the money to spend, but it is seldom profitable to do so. A good soil is one that nature made good. When purchasing a farm, the prospective part-time farmer should not attach too much importance to the buildings other than the residence. These other buildings, if they are not needed, increase overhead expenses and if not kept in repair make the property unsightly.

The prospective part-time farmer should select a farm as near his outside employment as possible, preferably within five miles. He should locate relatively near the urban center where more employment is likely to be available and in order that trips for recreation and shopping may be quickly and cheaply made. An all-weather road is a necessity if the part-time farmer is to use his car thruout the year. The availability of electricity, gas, telephone, delivery service, mail and bus service or other means of public transportation are important considerations especially to persons accustomed to those services in the city.

The desirable size of a part-time farm depends upon the size of the family, amount of outside employment and the type of farming to be attempted. The part-time farm should be large enough to furnish home-produced food for the family. The larger the family the greater the amount of available labor

and the greater the need for a larger farm not only to provide food for home use but to provide a remunerative employment for otherwise idle labor. It is unwise to buy a large acreage merely to use during a short period of unemployment unless provision is made for disposing of the excess acreage when it is no longer needed. If intensive gardening or trucking is contemplated a small acreage will be sufficient. However, if livestock and field crops are grown a larger acreage will be needed and less family labor per acre will be necessary.

Crops and livestock. The operator with steady outside employment will likely be interested only in a small garden, a cow, and possibly a few chickens, unless he has a large family and plenty of available family labor. An operator with less outside work would have more time available and might want a larger farm.

In his choice of crops and livestock the inexperienced part-time farmer should take into consideration the practices of those part-time farmers already in the area. He should not attempt to grow products new to the area until he has become acquainted with farming conditions there. The crops already grown are likely to be those that have proved most successful over a period of years. The new part-time farmer has even more need than the full-time farmer of consulting the county agricultural agent or other persons qualified to give practical advice concerning suitable farming practices.

SUMMARY

Hard-surfaced roads and inexpensive automobiles have enabled an increasing number of urban workers to undertake part-time farming. Ninety-five percent of the 329 part-time farmers in this study had had farming experience prior to the year of the study. Nearly sixty percent of these were between the ages of 35 and 55 years. One-fourth of them earned outside income as unskilled laborers, two-fifths as skilled or semi-skilled laborers and one-fourth were clerical or professional workers, or business men. Of these part-time farmers, 82 percent had an education equal to or above the sixth grade, 26 percent had had some high school training, and 8 percent had attended college.

Most of the part-time farms were situated near town. As the land was expensive, usually the part-time farms were small. Forty-two percent of them were less than 2.5 acres and averaged one-half acre or less in crops per farm. The total investment of the 236 owners averaged nearly \$4,000. One-third of the owners had mortgages on their farms averaging two-fifths of their value. The average investment in livestock and machinery was \$82 for the owners and \$41 for the 93 renters. Cows were kept by 60 percent of the operators, and chickens by 87 percent. Brood sows were kept by 22 percent of the operators and another 21 percent bought hogs for home butchering.

The total income of the 329 part-time farmers averaged \$1311, of which \$877, or 67 percent, was received from work done off the farm. Farm receipts comprised 6 percent, food furnished from the farm 11 percent, and the rental value of the dwelling 15 percent of the total income.

After expenses including unpaid family labor and interest on investment, were deducted, the average part-time farmer earned \$34 from his farm. These farm earnings plus income from other sources resulted in total labor earnings averaging \$933 per farm operator.

The amount of food furnished from the farm for home use showed little variation among the different outside-income groups and averaged twice the amount of farm receipts. Sixty percent of the total receipts from farm crops went to the 103 families that had an outside income ranging from \$1 to \$499.

The advantages of part-time farming apparently were due to decreased food and living costs rather than increased cash earnings. The security offered during periods of unemployment is an important factor which attracts persons engaged in seasonal industries or whose positions are insecure.

Contrary to popular opinion that part-time farming appeals to large-sized families, approximately one-third of these families were young couples with few children or retired couples whose children had left home. These small families required less garden and operated smaller farms with less unpaid family labor than did the larger families.

Most of the 209 part-time farmers in the three high outside-income groups moved from the city. They stated that they undertook part-time farming chiefly to satisfy their love of country life or to provide play space for their children, or both. Most of the persons in the two low-outside-income groups were living on part-time farms for economic reasons. Most of the 48 operators that moved from full-time farms were in these groups and mentioned need of supplementary income or a place for economical retirement as their reasons. Those that moved from the city, in these two low-income groups, mentioned economic reasons such as the desire to grow a garden, to get the benefits of low rents, provide security in old age or to escape unemployment in the city.

The production of the three important kinds of food for home consumption—vegetables, dairy products, and poultry products—was the chief economic reason for living on a part-time farm. The average part-time farmer obtained nearly twice as much financial benefit from a cow as from a garden plot or poultry flock. However, many operators were unable to keep a cow because of small acreage.

Most of these part-time farmers lived less than five miles from their outside employment. One-fourth of them had no transportation costs. Twenty-nine operators lived over 9 miles from work and paid an average of 54 cents per working day for transportation. It is doubtful if these were saving money by living in the country.

The experience of these operators indicates that many persons who undertake part-time farming with the hope of financial gain are likely to be disappointed. The production of food for home use and the enjoyment of country life were the chief advantages to be gained by living on a part-time farm. Any one who anticipates becoming a part-time farmer should weigh the advantages and disadvantages very carefully before attempting the undertaking.

Food and housing are cheaper on a part-time farm than in the city. Approximately one-third of the food of these typical part-time farming families was furnished by the farm at a

cost somewhat below its cost in the city. Electricity, water, telephone, etc. may be obtained in the country but usually at a higher cost than in the city. Cheaper food and housing make the part-time farm most attractive to large families with small means because such families spend most of their income for food and rent. The children can be of much assistance in the farm work and not only receive the benefits that come from wholesome labor but also gain valuable knowledge concerning plants and animals. Families in urban centers, whose living expenditures are so high that food is not the chief item probably will be disappointed if they expect to greatly reduce their cost of living by moving to the country. It is wise to rent rather than to buy a part-time farm if one lacks farming experience or is a newcomer in the area. The first error of the city man is overconfidence in his ability and his failure to appreciate generations of farm experience.

In most cases part-time farming should not be undertaken unless the entire family likes country life and is agreeable to the enterprise. The wife and children will be in the country thruout the day and must be able to find satisfactions in the country to replace those of the city. The family must also be willing to look after the farm and to care for the livestock and poultry while the operator is employed off the farm. The entire family must co-operate if the farm venture is to succeed.

Since the part-time farmer and his family will be somewhat removed from the urban center it will be advantageous for them to establish their community contacts locally. Good community organizations, schools, and churches are essential if the farm life is to be complete. The establishment of such contacts increases the likelihood that the family will remain satisfied in the new location.

**KENTUCKY PUBLICATIONS OF INTEREST TO THE
PART-TIME FARMER***

- The Vegetable Garden. Extension Circular 243
Hotbeds and Cold Frames. Extension Circular 276
Suggested Remedies for Some Garden Insects that May be Pests in
1935. W. A. Price
The Mexican Bean Beetle. Extension Circular 257
Small-Fruit Project for 4-H Clubs. Extension Circular 98
Grapes for the Home. Extension Circular 209
Orcharding. Extension Circular 118
Control of Fruit Pests. Bulletin 353
Dairy Project for 4-H Clubs. Extension Circular 250
Feeding Dairy Cows for Profit. Extension Circular 227
Producing Milk of Good Quality. Extension Circular 249
Making Cottage Cheese in the Home. Henry B. Morrison
Farm Butter Making. Henry B. Morrison
Chickens Help You Live at Home. Poultry Leaflet No. 2
When and How to Cull. Extension Circular 167
Poultry Parasites and Sanitation. Extension Circular 265
Helpful Hints for Poultrymen. J. H. Martin and Stanley Caton
Brooding Chicks Artificially. Extension Circular 157
A Metal-Drum Brooder Stove. Poultry Leaflet No. 6
A Homemade Brick Brooder. Poultry Leaflet No. 5
Killing, Cutting and Curing Pork. Extension Circular No. 261
Home Canning. Extension Circular 220
Home Storage Structures and Equipment. Extension Circular 266
Painting the Exterior of the Home. Extension Circular 241

* Single copies of these publications can be obtained free, from the College of Agriculture, University of Kentucky, Lexington.